

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed on 10/19/2007.

Claims 1-7 are pending and have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims **1-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by **Harris et al. (Publication no.: US 2003/0188306 A1)**

With respect to **claim 1**, Harris teaches a network application system comprising:

a network server (Harris, fig. 1 and page 2, paragraph 19, noted the central system 12);

a first communication device (Harris, fig. 1, and page 2, paragraph 19, noted the site controller 16);

a plurality of second communication devices (Harris, fig. 1 and page 2, paragraph 19, noted the gaming machines 14); and

an application, the application being stored by the first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices (Harris, page 2, paragraph 26 and 27,

noted that the image is transferred to the site controller and the gaming machines), wherein:

the application comprises a wide-area module configured to connect the network server and the first communication device via a wide-area communications network and a local-area module configured to connect the first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices via a local-area communications network (Harris, page 2, paragraph 19 and 27, noted that the connection between the central system to the gaming machines can be LAN and/or WAN); and the first communication device transmits a result to the network server via the wide-area communications network, the result being obtained by executing the application on the first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices via the local-area communications network (Harris, page 2 paragraph 25, page 3, paragraphs 28-33, noted that upon completion of downloading the software image to the site controller and gaming machines, execution of the software image in verifying the image signature is carried out, and a result of this verification is sent back to the central system to verify the completion of the download).

With respect to **claim 2**, Harris teaches the network application system according to claim 1, wherein further comprising a plurality of groups, first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices constituting one of the plurality of groups (Harris, Fig. 1 and page 2, paragraph 19).

With respect to **claim 3**, Harris teaches a method of managing a network application system, wherein an application comprises a wide-area module portion

configured to connect a network server and a first communication device via a wide-area communications network and a local-area module configured to connect the first communication device and a plurality of second communication devices via a local-area communications network, the method comprising:

executing the application on the first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices via the local-area communications network (Harris, page 2 paragraph 25, page 3, paragraphs 28-33); and

transmitting a result from the first communication device to the network server via the wide-area communications network, the result being obtained by said executing the application on the first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices via the local-area communications network (Harris, page 2 paragraph 25, page 3, paragraphs 28-33).

With respect to **claim 4**, Harris teaches the method according to claim 3, further comprising:

generating processed data by processing the result received by the network server (Harris: page 3, paragraphs 33 & 35, noted that after the result of verification is checked, the central system sends a command to the devices);

transmitting the processed data from the network server to the first communication device via the wide-area communications network (Harris: page 2, paragraph 27 and page 3, paragraph 35); and

transmitting the processed data from the first communication device to the plurality of second communication devices via the local-area communications network (Harris: page 2, paragraph 27 and page 3, paragraph 35).

With respect to **claim 5**, Harris teaches the method according to claim 4, further comprising of:

transmitting the application from the network server to the first communication device via the wide-area communications network (Harris, page 2, paragraph 26); and

transmitting the application from the first communication device to the plurality of second communication devices via the local-area communications network (Harris, page 2, paragraph 27).

With respect to **claim 6**, Harris teaches the method according to claim 4, wherein the network application system comprises a plurality of groups, the first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices, constituting one of the plurality of groups (Harris, Fig. 1 and page 2, paragraph 19)..

With respect to **claim 7**, Harris teaches the method according to claim 5, wherein the network application system comprises a plurality of groups, the first communication device and the plurality of second communication devices, constituting one of the plurality of groups (Harris, Fig. 1 and page 2, paragraph 19)..

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5. In response to applicant's argument that: "However, Harris discloses that once the [software] image has been successfully transferred to the device, the [software] image can be executed." Harris, para. [0035]. Therefore, the "acknowledge signals" of Harris are sent to the central system 12 after downloading the software image but before the software image is executed on the site controller 16. Accordingly, the "acknowledge signals" merely acknowledge a download of the software image by the site controller 16, but do not indicate a result of the execution of the software image by the site controller 16. See Harris, para. [0029]. Thus, the "acknowledge signals" in Harris cannot constitute a teaching or suggestion of "the result being obtained by executing the application on the first communication device," as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).".

6. The Examiner disagrees. The present claim language of claim 1 recites "transmits a result to the network server ..., the result being obtained by executing the application...", wherein the term "result" is not explicitly defined by the present claim language. Therefore, it is the Examiner's position to interpret the claim language as broadly and as reasonably possible in light of Specification. That is the phrase "result being obtained by executing the application" can be any type of result that's executed with regard to the application. In the of case of Harris, the Examiner equates such execution result of the application with the execution of the software image in verifying the image signature, and such result of verification is sent back to the central system to verify the completion of the download as disclosed in Harris page 2 paragraph 25, page 3, paragraphs 28-33.

7. Applicant has had an opportunity to amend the claimed subject matter, and has failed to modify the claim language to distinguish over the prior art of record by clarifying or substantially narrowing the claim language. Thus, Applicant apparently intends that a broad interpretation be given to the claims and the Examiner has adopted such in the present and previous Office action rejections. See *In re Prater and Wei*, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969), and MPEP 2111.

8. Applicant employs broad language, which includes the use of word, and phrases, which have broad meanings in the art. In addition, Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. As the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is forced to interpret the claim limitations as broadly and as reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.1993).

9. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response, and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly defines the claimed invention.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Guo et al. (PGPUB. No.: US 2003/0204565 A1) discloses a method for supporting real-time multi-user distributed applications.
- Poulin (PGPUB. No.: US 2003/0008712 A1) discloses a method for distributing a multi-client game/application over a communications network.
- Zilliacus et al. (Patent no.: US 6,893,347 B1) discloses a method for playing games between the clients of entities at different locations.

- Anttila et al. (PGPUB. No.: US 2003/0114224 A1) discloses a method for distributed game over a wireless telecommunications network.
- Puskala (PGPUB. No.: US 2002/0165024 A1) discloses a method for transmission of predefined messages among wireless terminals accessing an on-line service, and a wireless terminal.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lin Liu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1447. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. L./



Art Unit: 2145

/Lin Liu/

Examiner, Art Unit 2145

/Jason D Cardone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145